

4 month reporting date 7/20/07 received 7/30/07
8 month reporting date 11/20/07 received 11/19/07
12 month completion date 3/20/08

Wagner School District Improvement Plan/Progress Report Form

Principle : 1 General Supervision

Present levels: (Statement of present levels of performance that resulted in area of non-compliance)

Out of Compliance: Needs Intervention

ARSD 24:05:17:03 Annual report of children served

ARSD 25:05:24:01:13 Orthopedic impairment defined.

Orthopedic impairment is an impairment caused by a congenital anomaly, such as club foot or absence of some member; a disease, such as poliomyelitis, or bone tuberculosis; or another cause, such as cerebral palsy, an amputation, or a fracture or burn that causes contractures.

There must be evidence of the following:

- 1. That the student's impaired motor functioning significantly interferes with educational performance;**
- 2. That the student exhibits deficits in muscular or neuromuscular functioning that significantly limit the student's ability to move about, sit, or manipulate materials required for learning;**
- 3. That the student's bone, joint, or muscle problems affect ambulation, posture, or gross and fine motor skills; and**
- 4. That current medical data by a qualified medical evaluator describes and confirms an orthopedic impairment.**

The monitoring team was unable to validate placement on the child count in the appropriate placement category for three students. The evaluation information in the student file did not support placement in the category listed. The monitoring team noted:

Student 1, 2, and 6 are reported as a 530 (510,535,550) on the 2005 child count, however evaluation data does not support eligibility in the area of 535. There was no documentation by a qualified medical evaluator to confirm an orthopedic impairment (4).

Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families.

The district will establish procedures for collecting, maintaining and reporting accurate child count data.

Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. **(Multiple goals may be identified for each principle.**

Please complete a new sheet for each goal.)

The district will collect, maintain and report accurate child count data.

Short Term Objectives: Include the specific measurable results that will be accomplished and the criteria that will be used to measure the results.

Timeline for Completion

Person(s) Responsible

Record Date Objective was Completed

4 month reporting date 7/20/07 received 7/30/07
 8 month reporting date 11/20/07 received 11/19/07
 12 month completion date 3/20/08

<p>1. What will the district do to improve? The district will provide training to improve the procedures staff will use to track, collect, maintain and report accurate child count data.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? A copy of the agenda which includes the topic of the training, trainer, time, place, agenda, a list of those invited, participated and completed the training.</p>	<p>May 14, 2007</p>	<p>Administrators, Special Education Coordinator, special ed./general ed. teachers</p>	<p>Goal Met</p>
<p>Please explain the data (4 month): The Special Education Coordinator contracted with the CIMP team leader to provide training to the Wagner Community School special education staff and service providers from South Central Cooperative. The agenda included all the procedures staff will use to: track, collect, maintain and report accurate child count data, Barb Boltjes was the trainer, it was held Friday, April 27, 2007 from 12:30-3:30 in the LDL room at Wagner Community School, the people invited and attending included: Julie Doom, Julie Oelke, Jody Kocer, Jennifer Martinez, Mieke Slaba, Linda Broecher-Pfeifer, Cheryl Juracek, Tammy Weisser, Kari Gosmire, Judy Barnett, Ruth Vande Zande, Therese Soukup, Ericka Kotab, Kellie Stukel, Brad Ramey, John Fathke and Patricia White Horse-Carda. All but one person attended, Ann Hecht, who had a doctor's appointment she could not reschedule.</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (8 month) Wagner Community School staff, Patricia White Horse-Carda, Linda Pfeifer, Jody Kocer, Julie Doom, and South Central Cooperative staff, Ericka Kotab, Jennifer Schultz, Sandy VanderWal and Lisa Brumbaugh attended the IEP Workshops conducted at Mitchell on 9/25/07 and at Yankton on 9/26/07. This workshop addressed the Agenda Process for Individual Education Program Development, Child Find, Pre-referral Strategies, Referral to Special Education, Determining Suspected Areas of Disability, Prior Notice/Consent, Procedural Safeguards, Evaluation Procedures, Reporting, Determining Eligibility, IEP Team, Developing the IEP • Cover page data • Present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP's) • Considerations of special factors • State and district wide testing • Transition services/activities • Writing annual goals • Measuring progress • Modifications/Accommodations • Related services • Determining State/District assessment Accommodations • Least restrictive environment (LRE) • Extended school year (ESY) and Addendums – documenting change.</p> <p>Patricia White Horse-Carda attended the Data Management Workshop for SPED Directors at Sioux Falls on 10/25/07. This workshop was offered jointly for Data Managers and Special Education Directors. The morning session covered special education enrollment information and preparing for childcount. In the afternoon, the groups split into two sections. The Special Education Directors will focus on the collection, reporting, and analysis is SPP data.</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (12 month)</p>			

4 month reporting date 7/20/07 received 7/30/07
 8 month reporting date 11/20/07 received 11/19/07
 12 month completion date 3/20/08

<p>2. What will the district do to improve? Students reported on the December 1st child count will have an active IEP in place based on proper evaluation information.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The district will collect and report data to show evaluation information supports the disability category. The district will report the number of files reviewed since the onsite review and the number of files which meet the above criteria.</p>	<p>December 1, 2007</p>	<p>Administrators, Special Education Coordinator, special ed./general ed. teachers</p>	<p>Continue</p>
<p>Please explain the data (4 month): The special education coordinator checked 50% of all student files reported on the December 1st child count to document the number of active IEPs in place that supports the disability category. Of the 86 of 173 files reviewed, one file did not have the correct documentation however that student is scheduled to have a reevaluation completed by 9/28/2007 with documentation from all sources. If the child is in the wrong category and is eligible then the placement committee will present the findings at a meeting and a decision will be made at that time.</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (8 month) The special education coordinator checked the remaining 50% of the student files reported on the December 1st child count to document the number of active IEPs in place that supports the disability category. Of the 87 of 173 files reviewed, one file did not have the correct documentation. The student was reevaluated with documentation from all sources. The test results indicated the student id not meet the three prong approach for determining eligibility and was subsequently dismissed. The 12/01/07 child count will indicate the number of students who have been reevaluated and dismissed because they no longer meet the criteria for writing an IEP for them.</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (12 month)</p>			

<p>Principle: 3 Appropriate Evaluation</p>

4 month reporting date 7/20/07 received 7/30/07
8 month reporting date 11/20/07 received 11/19/07
12 month completion date 3/20/08

Present levels:

Needs Intervention-Out of Compliance

Issues requiring immediate attention

ARSD 24:05:24.01:01. Students with disabilities defined. Students with disabilities are students evaluated in accordance with chapter 24:05:25 as having autism, deaf-blindness, deafness, hearing impairment, mental retardation, multiple disabilities, orthopedic impairment, other health impairments, emotional disturbance, specific learning disabilities, speech or language impairments, traumatic brain injury, or visual impairments including blindness, which adversely affects educational performance, and who, because of those disabilities, need special education or special education and related services. If it is determined through an appropriate evaluation, under chapter 24:05:25, that a student has one of the disabilities identified in this chapter, but only needs a related service and not special education. The student is not a student with a disability under this article. If, consistent with this chapter, the related service required by the student is considered special education, the student is a student with a disability under this article.

ARSD 24:05:25:04.03. Determination of eligibility Upon completing the administration of tests and other evaluation materials as required by this chapter, the individual education program team and other individuals required by § 24:05:25:04.02 shall determine whether the student is a student with a disability, as defined in this article. The school district shall provide a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of determination of eligibility to the parent. A student may not be determined to be a student with a disability if the determinant factor for that decision is lack of instruction in reading or math or limited English proficiency and if the student does not otherwise meet the eligibility criteria under chapter § 24:05:24.01

ARSD 24:05:17:10. Disproportionality The division shall provide for the collection and examination of data to determine whether significant disproportionality based on race is occurring in the state with respect to:

- (1) The identification of children as children with disabilities, including the identification of children as children with disabilities in accordance with a particular impairment described in chapter 24:05:24.01; and
- (2) The placement in particular educational settings of these children.

In the case of a determination of significant disproportionality with respect to the identification of children as children with disabilities, or the placement in particular settings of these children, the division shall provide for the review of and, if appropriate, revision of the policies, procedures, and practices used in identification or placement to ensure compliance with the requirements of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

*The monitoring team determined through files review and staff interview the district is using the category of speech language for students who are eligible for services in other categories. The primary reason stated was concern for the feelings of parents and lack of information. However, the evaluation data available in student files supported other categories such as autism, specific learning disability, developmental delay and mental retardation. This occurred in nine of 50 student files reviewed.

The district was flagged for disproportionate numbers on the 2005 child count in the area of speech and language and specific learning disability. The number of students placed on the 2006 child count in the area of speech language has increased from 72 (2005) to 74 (2006). This number does not include those students who receive speech language as a related service.

4 month reporting date 7/20/07 received 7/30/07
8 month reporting date 11/20/07 received 11/19/07
12 month completion date 3/20/08

ARSD 24:05:25:04.02. Determination of needed evaluation data. As part of an initial evaluation, if appropriate, the individual education program team required by § 24:05:27:01.01 and other individuals with knowledge and skills necessary to interpret evaluation data, determine whether the child has a disability, and determine whether the child needs special education and related services, as appropriate, shall:

- (1) Review existing evaluation data on the child, including:
 - (a) Evaluations and information provided by the parents of the child;
 - (b) Current classroom-based assessments and observations; and
 - (c) Observations by teachers and related services providers; and
- (2) Based on the above review and input from the student's parents, identify what additional data, if any, are needed to determine:
 - (a) Whether the student has a particular category of disability as described in this article;
 - (b) The present levels of performance and educational needs of the student; and
 - (c) Whether the student needs special education and related services.

The school district shall administer tests and any other evaluation materials as may be needed to produce the data required to make the determinations listed in subdivision (2) of this section. If no additional data are needed to make the determinations listed in subdivision (2) of this section, the school district shall notify the student's parents of this fact and the reasons for this decision. The group described in this section may conduct its review without a meeting.

*Through files reviews and staff interviews, the monitoring team noted parent input into the evaluation process was not consistently documented in student files.

Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families.

The district will obtain parental input and place students in the proper disability category based on evaluation information.

Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. **(Multiple goals may be identified for each principle. Please complete a new sheet for each goal.)**

The district will seek parental input, determine eligibility and document the placement category based on evaluation information.

12 month completion date 3/20/08

[illegible]

4 month reporting date 7/20/07 received 7/30/07
8 month reporting date 11/20/07 received 11/19/07
12 month completion date 3/20/08

Please explain the data (4 month):

The Special Education Coordinator contracted with the CIMP team leader to provide training to the Wagner Community School special education staff and service providers from South Central Cooperative.

The agenda included all the procedures staff will use in the area of parent input into the evaluation, evaluation and determining eligibility, Barb Boltjes was the trainer, it was held Friday, April 27, 2007 from 12:30-3:30 in the LDL room at Wagner Community School, the people invited and attending included: Julie Doom, Julie Oelke, Jody Kocer, Jennifer Martinez, Mieke Slaba, Linda Broecher-Pfeifer, Cheryl Juracek, Tammy Weisser, Kari Gosmire, Judy Barnett, Ruth Vande Zande, Therese Soukup, Ericka Kotab, Kellie Stukel, Brad Ramey, John Fathke and Patricia White Horse-Carda. All but one person attended, Ann Hecht, who had a doctor's appointment she could not reschedule.

The attached chart indicates the 12 student files reviewed and the answers to the three questions.

Please explain the data (8 month)

Wagner Community School staff, Patricia White Horse-Carda, Linda Pfeifer, Jody Kocer, Julie Doom, and South Central Cooperative staff, Ericka Kotab, Jennifer Schultz, Sandy VanderWal and Lisa Brumbaugh attended the IEP Workshops conducted at Mitchell on 9/25/07 and at Yankton on 9/26/07. This workshop addressed the Agenda Process for Individual Education Program Development, Child Find, Pre-referral Strategies, Referral to Special Education, Determining Suspected Areas of Disability, Prior Notice/Consent, Procedural Safeguards, Evaluation Procedures, Reporting, Determining Eligibility, IEP Team, Developing the IEP • Cover page data • Present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP's) • Considerations of special factors • State and district wide testing • Transition services/activities • Writing annual goals • Measuring progress • Modifications/Accommodations • Related services • Determining State/District assessment Accommodations • Least restrictive environment (LRE) • Extended school year (ESY) and Addendums – documenting change.

Patricia White Horse-Carda attended the Data Management Workshop for SPED Directors at Sioux Falls on 10/25/07. This workshop was offered jointly for Data Managers and Special Education Directors. The morning session covered special education enrollment information and preparing for childcount. In the afternoon, the groups split into two sections. The Special Education Directors will focus on the collection, reporting, and analysis of SPP data.

Linda Pfeifer, high school Resource Room Teacher, attended the Regional transitional Meeting! Improving Outcomes by Writing Results-Oriented IEPs, featuring Ed O'Leary at Sioux Falls on 10/26/07. The training covered the following topics: *Using the Indicator 13 Checklist to Reach 100% Compliance for Special Education Programs and *Developing Results-Oriented IEPs for Transition students. She took a completed IEP and the *Technical Assistance Guide for Transition in the IEP*.

The 12/01/07 child count will indicate the number of students who have been reevaluated and dismissed because they no longer meet the criteria for writing an IEP for them. The attached chart indicates the 12 student files reviewed and the answers to the three questions since the 4 month submission.

Please explain the data (12 month)

4 month reporting date 7/20/07 received 7/30/07
8 month reporting date 11/20/07 received 11/19/07
12 month completion date 3/20/08

Principle: 5 Individualized Education Program

Present levels: (Statement of present levels of performance that resulted in area of non-compliance)

Needs Intervention: Out of Compliance

ARSD 24:05:30:15-Surrogate parents. Each school district shall establish procedures for the assignment of a surrogate parent to ensure that the rights of a child are protected if no parent can be identified and the district, after reasonable effort, cannot discover the whereabouts of a parent or if the child is a ward of the state. At a minimum, a district's method for determining whether a child needs a surrogate parent must include the following:

- (1) The identification of staff members at the district or building level responsible for referring students in need of a surrogate parent;
- (2) The provision of in-service training on the criteria in this section for determining whether a child needs a surrogate parent; and
- (3) The establishment of a referral system within the district for the appointment of a surrogate parent.

The district superintendent or designee shall appoint surrogate parents.

The district shall ensure that a person selected as a surrogate has no interest that conflicts with the interest of the child the surrogate represents and has knowledge and skills that ensure representation of the child. The district is responsible for the training and certification of surrogate parents and shall maintain a list of persons who may serve as surrogate parents.

A district may select as a surrogate a person who is an employee of a nonpublic agency that only provides noneducational care for the child and who meets the conflict of interest and knowledge standards in this section.

A person assigned as a surrogate may not be an employee of a public agency that is involved in the education or care of the child.

A person who otherwise qualifies to be a surrogate under the provisions of this section is not an employee of the agency solely because the person is paid by the agency to serve as a surrogate parent.

The surrogate parent may represent the student in all matters relating to the identification, evaluation, educational placement, and provision of FAPE to the students.

The district superintendent or a designee is responsible for reporting to the placement committee on the performance of the surrogate parent.

*The monitoring team determined through staff interview, the district does not have a list of potential surrogate parents.

4 month reporting date 7/20/07 received 7/30/07
 8 month reporting date 11/20/07 received 11/19/07
 12 month completion date 3/20/08

Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families. The district will develop and maintain a list of potential surrogate parents and provide surrogate parent training.			
Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. (Multiple goals may be identified for each principle. Please complete a new sheet for each goal.) The district will identify potential Surrogate Parents, such as community members, who are interested in protecting the rights of a child who needs an advocate during the special education process.			
Short Term Objectives: Include the specific measurable results that will be accomplished and the criteria that will be used to measure the results.	Timeline for Completion	Person(s) Responsible	Record Date Objective was Completed
1. What will the district do to improve? The district will develop a list of people in the community who are interested in becoming a surrogate parent. What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The list of Surrogate Parents who complete the training will be provided to SEP.	May 14, 2007	Administrators, Special Education Coordinator, special ed./general ed. teachers	Goal Met
Please explain the data (4 month): The special education coordinator contacted four people in the Wagner community who agreed to be trained as Surrogate Parents for the Wagner Community School District: Amy Doom, Lahoma Johnson, Patrick Breen and Bob Smith.			
Please explain the data (8 month) The special education coordinator will contact the four people in the Wagner community who were trained as Surrogate Parents for the Wagner Community School District to review their roles and responsibilities. This will be conducted by 12/ 17/2007.			
Please explain the data (12 month)			

4 month reporting date 7/20/07 received 7/30/07
 8 month reporting date 11/20/07 received 11/19/07
 12 month completion date 3/20/08

<p>2. What will the district do to improve? The special education coordinator has downloaded the Surrogate Training Manual and will train the list of people identified as interested in becoming a Surrogate Parent.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The trainer, training date, time, place and attendees will be provided to substantiate this Principle.</p>	<p>May 14, 2007</p>	<p>Administrators, Special Education Coordinator, special ed./general ed. teachers</p>	<p>Goal Met</p>
<p>Please explain the data (4 month): Patricia White Horse-Carda, Special Education Coordinator, trained the four people: Amy Doom, Lahoma Johnson, Patrick Breen and Bob Smith during three time frames, Amy Doom on May 3, 2007 at her home at 7:00 p.m.; Lahoma Johnson on May 6, 2007 at her home at 1:00 p.m. and Patrick Breen and Bob Smith at 4:00 p.m. on May 10, 2007 at their place of work.</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (8 month) The special education coordinator will contact the four people in the Wagner community who were trained as Surrogate Parents for the Wagner Community School District to review their roles and responsibilities. This will be conducted by 12/ 17/2007.</p>			
<p>Please explain the data (12 month)</p>			